



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/574,816	04/06/2006	Rui Yuge	20060477A	3663
513 7590 07/17/2008 WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P. 2033 K STREET N. W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1021				
EXAMINER KIM, TAEYOON				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1651				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/17/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/574,816

Applicant(s)

YUGE ET AL.

Examiner

Taeyoon Kim

Art Unit

1651

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 April 2008.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 46-63 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 46-63 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 46-63 are pending.

Response to Amendment

Applicant's amendment and response filed on 4/7/2008 has been received and entered into the case.

Claims 1-45 have been canceled, claims 46-63 are newly added, and claims 46-63 are pending and have been considered on the merits. All arguments have been fully considered.

Due to the cancellation of all the previously pending claims, the claim objection and rejections in the previous office action have been withdrawn.

The new abstract filed on 4/7/2008 is accepted.

Although applicant's arguments are moot in view of the cancellation of the previously pending claims and the new ground(s) of rejection, it is noted that the argument failed to address the primary reference, Pickhard, cited in the previous office action.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The unit for permeability disclosed in p.5 is not consistent. It appears that "mL/cm² 24 hr atm" is correct rather than "ml/ 24 hr atm" (line 25). Appropriate correction is required.

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: The term "a discharge part" in claims 55 and "a closing

member" in claim 61 does not have a proper antecedent basis from the specification.

Claim Objections

Claims 47, 53, 56 and 62 are objected to because of the following informalities:
The unit of permeability appears to be incorrect. It appears that 1 mL/cm² 24 hr atm is correct instead of the currently disclosed format. Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 50-52 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

Claims 50-52 and 54 recites the limitation "the gas permeable region" disclosed in claim 46. In claim 46, the gas permeable region is disclosed as being at least part of a tip of the plunger. Claims 50-52, however, claim the gas permeable region of claim 46 being in the main body or a closing member that covers the mouth of the vessel. Since claim 46 claims that the gas permeable region in the plunger, claims 50-52 are considered not to further limit the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 46-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pickhard (supra) in view of Dow Corning article (supra) and Codner (US 5,686,304) in

Art Unit: 1651

further view of Baidwan et al. (US 4,299,238), Karakashian (US 3,937,219) and Polak (US 5,114,421).

Pickhard teaches a syringe device having a housing (main body), slidable plunger (a volume varying means), a frontal end region (discharge part; a mouth part) linked an injection needle, a deformable ampoule (a contractible bag-type vessel) having a concertina section (see part #14 of Fig. 1 and 11), which can be ruptured (opened) by a piercing device (part #30 of Fig. 11). Pickhard also teaches the material for the deformable ampoule being pharmaceutical rubber or silicone (see column 8, lines 15-21). Since silicone is well known in the art as a gas permeable material as supported by the Dow Corning article (see the Table of Permeability rate of silicone rubber).

Although Pickhard does not teach the intended use of the device to hold handling medium containing cells, the silicone vessel (ampoule) of Pickhard is considered to be suitable for cell culturing. This is because Codner teaches a bag-like vessel made of gas-permeable silicone membranes is suitable for cell culture (see abstract). Thus, the silicone ampoule of Pickhard would be considered to be capable for cell culturing as claimed invention.

With regard to the limitation of oxygen permeability, since plastic is well known in the art to be oxygen permeable, the examiner takes the position that the plastic material used in Pickhard would have inherently met the limitation of quantity of the gas permeability in terms of overall oxygen permeability claimed in the instant invention.

The Patent and Trademark Office is not equipped to conduct experimentation in

order to determine whether or not applicants' gas permeable material differs, and if so to what extent, from the plastic material (a gas permeable resin) discussed in Pickhard. Accordingly, it has been established that the prior art material demonstrates a reasonable probability that it is either identical or sufficiently similar to the claimed material for gas permeability region that whatever differences exist are not patentably significant. Therefore, the burden of establishing novelty or unobviousness by objective evidence is shifted to applicants.

Merely because a characteristic of a known plastic material is not disclosed in a reference does not make the known plastic material patentable. The new material possesses inherent characteristics which might not be displayed in the tests used the reference. Clear evidence that the plastic of the cited prior art do not possess a critical characteristic that is possessed by the claimed gas permeable resin, would advance prosecution and might permit allowance of claims to applicants' device.

Pickhard does not teach the gas permeable region being formed at a tip of the plunger.

Baidwan et al. teach a vented piston (see Abstract and Fig.1).

It would therefore have been obvious for the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the piston of Baidwan et al. in the syringe device of Pickhard.

The skilled artisan would have been motivated to make such a modification because the vented piston of Baidwan et al. is to exhaust the air while pushing the piston, and it is considered the same purpose as the gas permeable region on the main

body (barrel) taught by Karakashian. Thus, a person of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to use the vented piston of Baidwan et al. to further facilitate pressure equalization to relieve back pressure with reasonable expectation of success.

Since the gas permeable region formed at the tip of the plunger of Baidwan et al. is for the same purpose as the gas permeable region of Polak, it would have been obvious to combine these two components for the syringe of Pickhard in view of Dow Corning article, in further view of Karakashian and Polak.

M.P.E.P. §2144.06 states "It is prima facie obvious to combine two compositions each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose, in order to form a third composition to be used for the very same purpose. [T]he idea of combining them flows logically from their having been individually taught in the prior art." *In re Kerkhoven*, 626 F.2d 846, 850, 205 USPQ 1069, 1072 (CCPA 1980) (citations omitted) (Claims to a process of preparing a spray-dried detergent by mixing together two conventional spray-dried detergents were held to be prima facie obvious.). See also *In re Crockett*, 279 F.2d 274, 126 USPQ 186 (CCPA 1960) (Claims directed to a method and material for treating cast iron using a mixture comprising calcium carbide and magnesium oxide were held unpatentable over prior art disclosures that the aforementioned components individually promote the formation of a nodular structure in cast iron.); and *Ex parte Quadranti*, 25 USPQ2d 1071 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1992) (mixture of two known herbicides held prima facie obvious).

Pickhard is silent of the gas permeable region on a main body extending in a sliding direction of plunger.

Karakashian teaches that a barrel of a syringe device is made of plastic, which is inherently gas permeable (see column 3, lines 44-51).

It would therefore have been obvious for the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the syringe device of Packard having a main body (barrel) being gas permeable.

The skilled artisan would have been motivated to make such a modification because Karakashian teaches that having the barrel gas-permeable, it would be efficient to sterilize the device by gas sterilization to prevent contamination. Such modification would inherently meet the limitation of intended use of the device in cell handling.

The person of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in making the main body or barrel of Pickhard's syringe device to be gas permeable.

Furthermore, it is noted that it is extremely well known in the art that majority of syringe device is made of plastic and thus gas permeable. Therefore, it would have been obvious to person of ordinary skill in the art to try to make the barrel of Pickhard's device with plastic resin because there are a finite number of gas permeable material available for making a syringe barrel, and plastic material or plastic resin is common material known in the art for such purpose.

The Supreme Court recently states in *KSR v. Teleflex* (550 US82 USPQ2d 1385, 2007) "The same constricted analysis led the Court of Appeals to conclude, in error, that a patent claim cannot be proved obvious merely by showing that the combination of

elements was "obvious to try." *Id.*, at 289 (internal quotation marks omitted). When there is a design need or market pressure to solve a problem and there are a finite number of identified, predictable solutions, a person of ordinary skill has good reason to pursue the known options within his or her technical grasp. If this leads to the anticipated success, it is likely the product not of innovation but of ordinary skill and common sense. In that instance the fact that a combination was obvious to try might show that it was obvious under §103."

With regard to the modification to the mouth (discharge part) of the vessel being covered with a closing member, it is well known in the art that any syringe type device would be capable of being connected to other conduit or a catheter, and using a cap to close the opening at the end of the discharge part. In fact, Pickhard discloses a coupling component communicating with hypodermic needle by way of flexible tubing (catheter or conduit) (see column 16, lines 23-26). Furthermore, Polak teaches a fitted cap to close the opening at the end of the syringe barrel (see column 11, lines 12-14; and Fig. 5, #127).

With regard to the limitations that the multiple locations of gas permeable region on the main body which extends in a sliding direction of the plunger and the gas permeable region having higher gas permeability than the principal material of the main body, the teaching of Karakashian indicates that the whole main body is made of plastic and therefore considered to have gas permeable region at a sliding direction of the plunger.

However, Pickhard in view of Karakashian do not teach differential permeability

of the gas permeable region and the main body.

Polak teaches a syringe barrel having a region (a hole) made of gas permeable membrane (see Fig. 7-9), which is a liquid-impervious and gas permeable semi-permeable membrane (see column 7, lines 4-26), and therefore it is considered to be porous film and apparently having higher gas permeability than the plastic material of Karakashian.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the barrel of Polak's syringe in the syringe device of Pickhard in view of Karakashian. This is because the syringe of Polak is considered as an art-accepted equivalent to the Karakashian. Furthermore, the gas-permeable membrane of Polak provides pressure equalization and thereby relieves the back pressure, while maintaining a sterile environment in syringe assembly (see column 11, lines 55-63). Therefore, the addition of gas-permeable membrane hole to the syringe of Pickhard

Although Polak does not particularly teach the shape of the hole having gas permeable membrane extending in a sliding direction of the plunger, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to try various different shapes or number of holes made in the main body.

With regard to shape change, M.P.E.P. §2144.04 states "In re Dailey, 357 F.2d 669, 149 USPQ 47 (CCPA 1966) (The court held that the configuration of the claimed disposable plastic nursing container was a matter of choice which a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found obvious absent persuasive evidence that the particular configuration of the claimed container was significant.)."

Therefore, the invention as a whole would have been prima facie obvious to a person of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Taeyoon Kim whose telephone number is (571)272-9041. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am - 4:00 pm ET (Mon-Thu).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Wityshyn can be reached on 571-272-0926. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1651

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Leon B Lankford/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1651

Taeyoon Kim
AU-1651